

farmers, supports our food banks, and gets healthy food into schools. Yet, this administration is cutting the very funding that food banks and local schools utilize to purchase food at farms, and they are leaving our neighbors and kids with fewer healthy, affordable options.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot think of a more American program that serves our communities, and that is why I will continue to fight for our food banks and our neighbors.

#### FEMA, NOAA, AND NATIONAL FIRE ACADEMY ARE NOT OPTIONAL ITEMS TO CUT

(Mrs. McCLAIN DELANEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. McCLAIN DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my deep concern for the senseless defunding of FEMA and critical public safety agencies that protect our communities and strengthen our national resilience.

Recent examples also include canceling classes at the National Fire Academy and defunding parts of NOAA and the Emergency Weather Service. This isn't just bad policy; it puts lives at risk.

This past month, we have seen historic flooding in my district in Allegany County, tornadoes ripping across the Midwest, wildfires burning unchecked, and hurricanes that level communities.

Yet, nonsensically, the Acting Administrator of FEMA just admitted that he didn't even realize that hurricane season existed. With extreme blowback, he then said that he was joking. Emergencies are no joke.

What this does is really demonstrates a lack of understanding of the value of the very agencies tasked with protecting the American people.

FEMA, NOAA, and the National Fire Academy are not optional items to cut. They are essential pillars of our emergency response and national security and contribute to our resilience.

In my district and across the country, we must come together to act collectively in a bipartisan manner to fund and respond to national emergencies, which hit everywhere despite ZIP Code, circumstance, or party.

I will fight for our communities and for that help in Allegany County that they need, and I urge my colleagues to also fund and support the agencies that serve us faithfully every day.

□ 1740

#### HONORING JAKE LARSON

(Mr. DESAULNIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor World War II veteran and D-Day survivor "Papa" Jake

Larson for his invaluable contributions to our country.

After Pearl Harbor, Jake was eager to serve his country. He enlisted in the National Guard at 15 years old, not telling the truth about his age. He was sent to Europe, where he assisted in the planning of and participated in the Invasion of Normandy on D-Day and bravely endured six battles, including the Battle of the Bulge.

More recently, at 102 years old, Jake's storytelling on social media about his military service has earned him over 1.3 million social media followers and the nickname "Papa Jake."

As we commemorate the 81st anniversary of D-Day, I extend my gratitude and respect to Jake for his extraordinary service to this country.

Please join me in recognizing "Papa" Jake Larson for his dedicated service to America.

#### SUPPORTING THE BIG, BEAUTIFUL BILL

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Mr. MOORE of Utah was recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.)

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOORE of North Carolina). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the floor this evening and to give that opportunity to some of my colleagues also, if their schedule permits.

We don't get enough opportunities to speak to the American people, and I don't get enough chances to speak to my constituents back home, particularly from the House floor. I think it is a unique opportunity that I will get to address a few things this evening.

I want to take a minute just to walk through, big picture, what we are accomplishing with this reconciliation bill titled the One Big Beautiful Bill Act, and walk through some of the provisions.

I actually tried my hardest back in my district to let facts rule the day and not be governed and manipulated by a lot of rhetoric about this particular type of work.

I am going to take you back, Mr. Speaker, to my first election when I first decided to run for Congress. It was the end of January 2020. We had never heard of the term "COVID" before. We had seen a tax reform bill take place at the end of 2017 that people couldn't really wrap their heads around.

I was working for a consulting firm, and I remember talking to some of the partners at the firm. I was a principal at the time—actually, I was probably an engagement manager at the time.

I remember them saying: We are going to see a significant tax decrease. If this bill goes through, we are going to have a substantial amount of extra discretionary money. What are we going to do with it? This is going to be significant.

More so, many of our clients that we served were going to all of a sudden see some discretionary income that they would now be able to use and had to figure out what they were going to do.

This wasn't a client of ours, but in the aftermath of that bill, this is what I understand took place. When they had a corporate tax rate decrease, they have shown me their books, and the areas that they prioritized were to increase wages for their frontline workers. They said every single person at the firm got a pay increase. They grew real wage growth without massive inflation that takes place sometimes under a reconciliation bill.

I will point to the American Rescue Plan that took place when Democrats took control of the White House, House, and Senate. We saw the worst inflation we have seen in my lifetime under the guise of a COVID relief package.

That company, which had some tax pressure removed from their books, went straight to their employees. They created wage growth opportunities. The other thing was that they had extra discretionary income to take to their immediate community in which they worked and bought ambulances for the emergency response in the community.

This is the type of stuff that happened across the country post-2017 when you saw a significant economic boon in the U.S.

Years prior to 2017, you saw a lot of companies decide there were favorable tax rates elsewhere. Oftentimes, in countries in Europe—there was a tax provision that was done in 2017 that is called FDII, an intangible income piece.

You can establish intellectual property overseas at a lower tax rate than what we were doing here in the U.S. We decided to make our rates in the U.S. competitive. That provision alone immediately stopped the term "corporate inversion," where U.S. companies were taking their revenue to other countries. Instead, they decided that they have a more favorable rate here, so they will bring it back. Most multinational companies, most U.S.-based companies, a lot of times foreign companies, want to be based here.

All we did with that rate was to say that we are going to make that rate competitive. With that, they repatriated their money back to the U.S.

When I talk to townhall participants, regular constituent meetings, I highlight that when you make taxes competitive, you get companies to reinvest back in the United States, and we then can grow our revenue.

Companies have told us since 2017, even though they got more favorable,

more fair, and competitive tax rates, they actually spend more money on their tax revenues to the U.S. Government.

The whole concept behind Republican tax policy is to make taxes competitive against the OECD, against our allies or our adversaries, to make sure we repatriate and keep that money in the U.S. and grow our revenues. That is why, even with tax cuts, we don't see a dip in what we have gained from revenue.

We can argue all day long, and you can even draw the graph: Should we be spending a higher percentage of our GDP? Should we be collecting a higher percentage of our GDP in tax revenues?

Twenty-five years ago, approximately 17 percent of GDP was what we collected in tax revenues, and at that same time, 17 percent of GDP was spending. In those 25 years, our spending has gone from 17 percent of GDP to approximately 26 percent of GDP. That is what our spending has done.

Our revenue has actually stayed at approximately 17 percent through Republican and Democratic administrations. That means our revenue has continued to grow, but it actually stays consistent as a percentage of our entire GDP. Our spending has grown, up to 26 percent.

That is why you see in a Republican reconciliation bill like we passed a couple of weeks ago that a significant portion of that bill is spending cuts, offsets to spending, and revenue increases. Yes, there are actually tax increases in a Republican bill, but overall, we are creating a very competitive tax rate that exists.

□ 1750

Companies from 2017 on have reinvested in the U.S. and, at the same time, have reinvested in their communities, reinvested in their employees, and have grown their presence. Most of that is set to expire at the end of this year. If we don't get a tax bill done, then you are just going to see a significant tax increase across everything.

Mr. Speaker, I will also talk briefly about some of the individual provisions because it is important to talk about the small business corporation, S corps, LLCs, all the various different types of businesses that we run here in the U.S., they all get a competitive tax rate, keeping them wanting to invest here in America and reinvesting in their business. If they can reinvest in their business, they can actually grow overall tax receipts because of the concept of economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, on the individual side, this is something that my Democrat colleagues oftentimes overlook. They oftentimes talk about, oh, this is just some tax giveaway to the billionaires. I have never seen anybody actually pinpoint and show me where this is targeted toward giving the billionaires some type of tax relief.

Probably the largest portion of this tax reconciliation bill is what is called

the standard deduction. The standard deduction is taken advantage of by over 90 percent of Americans. This is what simplifies our tax code. When you show up to do your taxes for that year, you are automatically given a dollar figure that you can deduct from your taxable income.

In 2017, that number was doubled. We said to middle-income filers, lower-income filers that we want to give you a significant deduction and we are going to double that standard deduction. It hasn't been done for a while. We need to increase this to a really healthy amount. That simply means that individual and married filing jointly can look at their tax bill and say, we are going to offset our taxable income by \$30,000. In a lot of cases that is a significant benefit to them because that helps lower their overall tax liability and puts money directly back in their pocket.

Guess what? It doesn't help the wealthy. The wealthy itemize their taxes. They will probably have more mortgage interest to write off than they will that \$30,000 standard deduction, if you will. Then all of a sudden, we see that that makes sense. We can see how the standard deduction actually affects middle- and lower-income Americans.

Okay. Why in the world do my Democrat colleagues keep repeating this constant—I think it might have just been something they saw in some polling that said: It works well if you say this is just tax cuts for the wealthy.

Let's look at the child tax credit. If you have a child under the age of 17—prior to 2017, it was \$1,000 that you were able to deduct from your taxable income. Republicans in 2017 doubled it and they set that amount for 8 years. That is what expires at the end of this year.

If Republicans don't act, that number goes back to \$1,000. Anybody that votes against this bill is saying: I am okay with that number going back to \$1,000. We actually, in this bill, repeat that \$2,000 amount per child, but we did something unique. We are going to index it to inflation. It is something we should always be thinking about doing in any type of tax policy. We are indexing it to inflation. We actually added an enhancement to it, so you are able to, for the next 4 years, take a \$2,500 deduction. If you are building a family, if you have young kids, this is a big expense. We are giving that tax relief to families so we can continue to grow our next generation.

The unique part is, in 4 years or so when that extra \$500 enhancement is up for renewal, we will have already grown the \$2,000 to be at approximately that level. What we are doing is, we are really doing right by individuals that are doing the right thing by investing in our future and raising kids.

Those two things are the biggest items of this entire bill. Then to go and say it is just some tax giveaway to the wealthy, it just flies in the face of re-

ality. It might poll well, I guess, but it is disheartening to see something that I actually believe most, if not all, Members of Congress believe in a simplified, higher standard deduction, increased child tax credit, which covers the vast majority of the cost of this bill.

Then you get to things that actually help individuals that we are doing with our research and development, helping small businesses be able to grow and have that discretionary income.

There is just so much here, and I would love to be able to, in long form, talk a little bit about the specifics because too often these become one-liners or a tweet here or there that says this or that. We are being as responsible as you possibly can be by making this bill deficit neutral.

We will see growth in our economy because of it. We will see historic decreases in our overall expenditure and spending, and at the same time have policies that will drive economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON), my good friend and also the chairman of the Budget Committee, who tirelessly works on all of these issues, to share a few words with us this evening.

I thank him for his dedication and time investing in me as a member of his committee, to help bring me up in the ways of doing the right thing for the right cause in all these things related to tax, spending, and such.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to Mr. ARRINGTON from the Permian Basin, the food, fuel, and fiber capital of the world.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. MOORE is a dear friend not only to me but to my children. My children don't know him well. They have met him, but the reason he is a friend to my children and to your children and grandchildren is because he is fighting for their future.

He cares about this Nation. He believes that we are on an unsustainable fiscal path and he believes that if we don't intervene, we will not only jeopardize our economic strength but our national security, our global leadership, and God forbid, a sovereign debt crisis certainly would rob our children of their freedom and opportunities in this great land.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. MOORE for his leadership on the committee. I thank him for his strong voice and vision and most of all for his courage to do the right thing not only for our citizens and our constituents of today but for generations of Americans, who, by the way, will inherit the whirlwind of our recklessness in terms of the unbridled spending and unsustainable debt if we don't step up in this historic moment.

Let me comment on some of the things that Mr. MOORE was mentioning in his remarks.

Let's do a comparison and contrast with our Democrat colleagues when they had control of both Chambers and the White House. They, too, used the tool of budget reconciliation to advance what was their partisan Democrat agenda.

Over the last 4 years under the Biden-Harris administration and Democrat control, they added \$8 trillion to the national debt.

They did it by expanding the Federal Government, offering ObamaCare to people making hundreds of thousands of dollars, price-fixing in the drug markets and having premiums go up on seniors.

They did it by expanding the IRS by 80,000 IRS agents and by offering tax subsidies to green energy corporations to the tune of \$850 billion.

When they had the tool of budget reconciliation and unified Democrat leadership, that was what they offered to the American people: more spending, more debt, more government, and less freedom.

□ 1800

We have the tools and unified Republican control of both Chambers, and we are investing in border security and defense because we believe the safety and security of the American people is job number one, like providing the common defense is the first and most important job of the Federal Government.

Secondly, we are spending money to allow hardworking American families to keep more of their money and to incentivize investment, growth, job creation, and wage increases. We have been sputtering along because of the failed economic policies of my Democratic colleagues in the Biden-Harris administration and their unbridled, reckless spending.

There is your comparison. One gives you more government with more spending and debt, and the other has a complete offset with a modest reduction in deficit spending, a 10-point reduction in debt to GDP. We have the largest tax cut, the largest spending cut, the largest investment in border security and defense in the history of this country, and the most significant commitment to unlocking American energy resources in our Nation's history.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of what we did in this bill. There is so much to talk about, but some of the myths and false claims that are propagated to suggest that this bill will somehow increase the debt are totally false and using a baseline, a CBO score, with a growth assumption based on the policies and laws of the last 4 years.

I think 1.8 percent growth is actually generous considering the last 4 years and the economic policies of our Democratic colleagues. What we did was we assumed a growth rate not based on CBO, JCT, or any other predictive modeling. We said the best way to predict future achievement is past performance.

What did President Biden have as an annual average growth rate? What did President Trump achieve? On average, Biden was at 2.7 if you control for COVID. If you control for COVID, then Trump had a 2.8 percent annual average. Since World War II, the annual average has been a little over 3 percent.

We picked a conservative number, but we know we will outperform it with good energy policies, work incentives, deregulation, America First trade, and locking in low taxes from TCJA.

That 2.6 annual average, that conservative growth assumption, will yield \$2.5 trillion over the 10-year budget window. If you stack the spending reforms—which, by the way, are the deepest cuts by two times in our Nation's history. If you add the two, you totally offset the cost of border, defense, and any cost associated with reducing taxes.

It is fiscally responsible. It will do the two things that you primarily need to do in order to restore the fiscal health of this country, put it on a stable path, and prevent or stave off a debt crisis of some magnitude. It grows the economy. It deals with economic growth, which brings revenue to the Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, 1 percent growth over the projections of CBO is \$3 trillion against the deficit, and it starts to bend the curve on deficit spending.

Now, is this going to save the country from a debt crisis in the future and address the \$120 trillion unfunded liabilities in 30-year accumulative projected debt? No, but this is the first in my lifetime, probably since the post-World War II era—when we were coming out of this same level of indebtedness, with a debt to GDP of around 120 percent—it is the first time since then and in my lifetime that we have taken a meaningful step with growth and spending reforms to start bending the debt-to-GDP curve and start turning this Titanic before it sinks and we do irreparable harm to our Nation and our kids' future.

We have to rinse and repeat this process. There are no silver bullets. There is no one reconciliation bill. Even in generations past, coming out of comparable debt after World War II took two decades, and that was an easier exercise in reducing spending because it was mainly defense after a war.

We are talking about entitlement spending. We are talking about a lot of promises made to a lot of people. We are talking about \$2 trillion that we are borrowing now annually to pay for those promises, 50 cents on the dollar of which is just servicing the debt or our interest payments.

Mr. Speaker, we have work to do. Nobody knows that better than Mr. MOORE. No one also has called out the debt and reality that at some point, with some of the larger mandatory spending programs, we are going to need Democrats and Republicans to

join forces to put the Nation first to solve the problems of sustainability and solvency of programs like Social Security and Medicare that our seniors depend on so that they can have peace of mind and so that our children can actually expect the same safety nets and the same opportunities in this country.

It will take tremendous political courage. Nobody has that more than my friend, BLAKE MOORE. He speaks the truth, and he has said this is his top priority since he was sworn in in his first term. He has made good on that pledge and promise.

I believe that if we continue to do the things that we are doing in the One Big Beautiful Bill Act, and we join forces like Ronald Reagan did with Tip O'Neill, which was the last time that Social Security and the solvency were addressed, I think, quite frankly, it is an opportunity made for President Trump. He is the greatest dealmaker we have ever had in the Oval Office.

When I was a freshman and he was recently elected, he did what nobody thought we could do. He revamped and restructured our biggest trade relationship and trade agreement with our two biggest partners, Canada and Mexico, which was known as NAFTA. Then, we had USMCA, and our trade activity and our jobs and wages in agriculture and manufacturing have gone up since, and we had overwhelming bipartisan support.

I have seen President Trump in action. I believe this will be not just a tremendous legacy. I think it would be the biggest legacy. Let's reignite growth. Let's rein in some of the spending and root out the waste, fraud, and abuse in these programs. Let's reinvest in our sons and daughters in uniform who do the most difficult and dangerous jobs.

Let's look not where the puck is but where the puck is going, as they say in hockey. Why would I know anything about hockey? I am from Plainview, Texas. We don't play hockey in west Texas, but I always loved that analogy. You have to skate to where the puck is going.

While we are doing these things in the short run, in this budget window, in this decade, let's look out and be leaders. Let's address those things that we know are coming, and that debt crisis that looms large.

Let's extend the hand of bipartisanship to our friends and Democratic colleagues, again, for the sake of this country, like my hero who inspired me to get involved in politics, Ronald Reagan, did back in the day.

I said that I want to be like that guy, and it was for a lot of reasons. I just got back from the economic forum out there in California and saw the museum. I was reminded of what a statesman leader he was and how he was the right person to work with Tip O'Neill and our Democratic colleagues to do something really big that hasn't been done in 40-plus years.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. MOORE for the opportunity to address our colleagues. I thank him for his leadership, his Conference leadership and on the Budget Committee and the Ways and Means Committee. It is an honor to work with him.

God bless our great country. Let's get that One Big Beautiful Bill Act and that America First vision that is wrapped in that reconciliation bill to the President's desk. Most importantly, let's make it a reality for the people we serve and for the country we love.

□ 1810

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from the Permian Basin.

Just to quickly recap, I love the concept that he juxtaposes to opportunities.

It is interesting that in our political environment, from 2017 to 2021 and 2025, we have seen the White House, House, and Senate flip completely three times. I think that is a little bit unprecedented. We mentioned there were times with Reagan where there was a sustained period of Democratic control of Congress but there were Republicans in the White House and vice versa.

To flip the White House, House, and Senate three times in the last 8 years is unprecedented. It gives us a unique opportunity, though.

Look at TCJA and ARPA. Look at the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act and then go look at the American Rescue Plan Act. Created wage growth, no inflation. Those are consistent things that took place from TCJA when tax reform took place with Republicans.

The American Rescue Plan was stimulus spending masquerading as COVID relief spending. It was massive amounts of monetary policy added to the system. There is only one equation, and that is inflation.

Look at the difference between an inflationist and real wage growth. Those are the two things we have to compare.

This bill basically takes 2017 and says we have seen this work. Democrats looked at the tax policy in 2017, when they had the White House, House, and Senate. They said: We like the standard deduction. We like the increased child tax credit. We like the approach to getting U.S. companies to reinvest in America. We are not going to touch it.

They had an opportunity to change all the things that they say are so bad in this bill. They didn't touch any of the core tax policies from 2017 to today. They expire at the end of this year.

Republicans are going to go at it alone. We are going to make sure we extend this out. We are going to give companies and families some consistency. All we have to do is juxtapose those two bills—the TCJA and the American Rescue Plan—and make the decision based on that. That is as simple as it needs to be.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON) likes to say a lot of things. He talks a lot. He is very verbose. When he mentions my leadership, I very much appreciate the sentiment. I have been watching and following him. He is my committee chair and has an extremely strong leadership in the conference.

I express my appreciation and downplay the fact that he is just blowing smoke there sometimes when he says it about me.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mrs. FEDORCHAK). I would like to get to some real substantive remarks now with my colleague.

Mrs. FEDORCHAK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the leadership of both Mr. MOORE and Mr. ARRINGTON. Both of them are great mentors to me as a new Member. I hope I can aspire to be as strong as they are someday.

Working-class families, seniors on fixed incomes, farmers growing our food, restaurant waitresses working double shifts, law enforcement officers putting in overtime, manufacturers keeping the lights on, and border communities shouldering a burden Washington created are who the one big, beautiful bill is going to help.

Who are these people? These aren't the millionaires and billionaires. These are everyday Americans. Despite what we hear from the Democrats and the media over and over again, this bill isn't tax cuts for the rich. It is not about eliminating healthcare for people who need it.

This big, beautiful bill is pro-family, pro-business and workers, pro-American energy and agriculture, pro-border and national security. Above all, it is pro-growth and pro-common sense.

Let me spend a few minutes talking about what that all means. Let's talk first about pro-family. My husband, Mike, and I have three children. Raising a family is one of life's greatest blessings and biggest responsibilities. Government should not make it even harder.

That is why the tax relief is a top priority for Republicans in Washington and is the centerpiece of the one big, beautiful bill. This bill includes a commonsense tax package that extends existing tax policy, avoiding the highest tax increase in U.S. history. That is right. This bill just extends existing tax policy, improves it, and avoids the highest tax increase in history.

It also enhances tax relief for working families. This one big, beautiful bill lets North Dakotans and Americans keep more of their hard-earned money.

A few key provisions include increasing the child tax credit to \$2,500 per child; raising the standard deduction for all filers; establishing savings accounts for newborns; and creating a new deduction on Social Security benefits for senior citizens.

For the average family of four in North Dakota, this package will help

save an estimated \$1,600 in taxes. That buys about 8 weeks of groceries. This is American money staying with the American family, which is exactly where it belongs.

This bill is also pro-business. The one big, beautiful bill also includes a long list of reforms and investments that will make America, including our small businesses, stronger and more competitive.

Our goal is to reward entrepreneurship, to reward hard work, and to grow the economy. For small businesses, we permanently increased the small business deduction to 23 percent. This will impact 67,000 North Dakota businesses.

This bill will allow 100 percent immediate expensing for equipment and facility upgrades and raise the death tax exemption, helping families pass down their farm or ranch to the next generation.

For workers, the one big, beautiful bill significantly reduces taxes on tips and overtime. This lets servers, bartenders, and hourly workers keep more of their money. This means that waitresses working late and the factory worker picking up an extra shift will finally keep more of what they earned.

It is time to bring common sense and competitiveness back to our economy, which is exactly what this bill does.

I will talk a bit about energy and agriculture, big industries for my State in North Dakota. We are slamming the breaks on the Biden administration's radical energy agenda. The one big, beautiful bill repeals over \$500 billion in the style of Green New Deal spending and boosts mineral development to reduce our reliance on China for critical materials.

It ends electric vehicle mandates and subsidies funded by taxpayers for wind and solar. This is a provision I have been working hard on since I arrived in Congress.

I am especially excited by the provisions in the one big, beautiful bill that support our North Dakota farmers and ranchers.

In addition to the tax provisions in the bill, which are very important for our farmers and ranchers, this bill significantly improves the core safety net and risk management tools by increasing reference prices and improving crop insurance.

It expands flexibility for family farms to reinvest in equipment, inputs, and labor. It renews 100 percent expensing for capital purchases so producers can write off the cost of new machinery, infrastructure improvements, or production facilities right away.

The bill also delivers on President Trump's promise to secure the border and enhance national security.

□ 1820

This bill includes the largest investment in border security in over a generation. There is nearly \$150 billion to secure the border and deport criminal illegal aliens. We are restoring order at the border and restocking our military.

We increase pay, housing, and healthcare for our servicemembers. We rebuild our naval fleet, modernize our air traffic control system, and restock the munitions America needs to defend itself.

Finally, this bill is pro-common sense. There are no more student loan bailouts, no more tax dollars for abortions or transgender surgeries on minors, and no more benefits for illegal immigrants who break our laws.

We are making universities pay more from their endowments, and we are taxing nonprofits that support terrorism.

We even impose a small fee on electric vehicles because they use our roads, too, and should help fund the highway trust fund.

It provides tax relief to Americans to exercise their Second Amendment rights for the first time in history.

I was proud to help move this legislation forward because North Dakotans and all Americans are tired of waste and overreach, and they are ready for real results from Washington.

This is about more than fixing broken policies. It is about turning the page on the last 4 years of dysfunction, division, and decline and writing a new chapter where government once again serves the people, where families can afford to grow, small businesses can afford to hire, and rural communities can thrive without interference from Washington.

It is about restoring common sense, restoring accountability, and rebuilding an America where people aren't just getting by. They are getting ahead.

This bill puts working families first. It reins in bureaucracy. It returns power to the people where it belongs.

Most importantly, this bill is just the beginning.

What an exciting time. I couldn't be happier to be here working with these great leaders and bringing forward important legislation just like this to make things better for America and the American people.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Dakota for her remarks.

I appreciate my colleagues for participating this evening. This is something historic, and it is something monumental.

As I was talking about at the beginning of my remarks, when I first ran for Congress in January 2020, the entire conversation of every single candidate was: How do we go about extending and making permanent the tax reform that just took place in our country a few years prior and the juice that it created for our economy and the growth that it had that was raising the tide of all income levels?

That was the concept, and 4½ years later, I am sitting here on the committee particularly regarding the tax policy to be able to bring it up.

This is a unique and really special time. We are already engaging with the

Senate to make sure this can adhere to and go through the Byrd rule, all the specifics of making this a reality.

This is an exciting moment. It will be monumental, and it will do so much good.

I have always said, as I have been involved in congressional policymaking, that we live in 2-year increments, but every CEO across the country has to live in 15-year increments. They have to see what is around the corner, and we are constantly putting people at an impasse because we just keep dealing with 2-year increments of what their policies are going to be.

We have to signal what the future holds with respect to tax policy, and there is nothing that would do more for sustained economic growth than this bill.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the time this evening and for my colleagues being here to share the message.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Kevin F. McCumber, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 87. Joint Resolution providing congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "California State Motor Vehicle and Engine Pollution Control Standards; Heavy-Duty Vehicle and Engine Emission Warranty and Maintenance Provisions; Advanced Clean Trucks; Zero Emission Airport Shuttle; Zero-Emission Power Train Certification; Waiver of Preemption; Notice of Decision".

H.J. Res. 88. Joint Resolution providing congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "California State Motor Vehicle and Engine Pollution Control Standards; Advanced Clean Cars II; Waiver of Preemption; Notice of Decision".

H.J. Res. 89. Joint Resolution providing congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "California State Motor Vehicle and Engine and Nonroad Engine Pollution Control Standards; The 'Omnibus' Low NO<sub>x</sub> Regulation; Waiver of Preemption; Notice of Decision".

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 5, 2025, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-1039. A letter from the Administrator, Cotton and Tobacco Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Tobacco Grading and Inspections Services-Rescission of Regulations Establishing Tobacco Price Support Provisions [Doc. No.: AMS-CN-25-0027] (RIN: 0581-AE39) received June 2, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC-1040. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Livestock and Poultry Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Rescinding Natural Grass Sod Promotion, Research, and Information Order; Referendum Procedures [Doc. No.: AMS-LP-21-0028] (RIN: 0581-AE07) received May 30, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC-1041. A letter from the Administrator, Dairy Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Rescission of the Dairy Donation Program [Doc. No.: AMS-DA-25-0026] (RIN: 0581-AE45) received May 30, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC-1042. A letter from the Administrator, Cotton and Tobacco Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Tobacco Grading and Inspections Services-Rescission of Tobacco Quota Provisions [Doc. No.: AMS-CN-25-0028] (RIN: 0581-AE40) received May 30, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC-1043. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; California; Revised Format for Materials Incorporated by Reference [EPA-R09-OAR-2024-0527; FRL-12400-01-R9] received June 3, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1044. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Clean Data Determination and Approval of Base Year Emissions Inventory; California; Los Angeles-South Coast Air Basin; 189(d) Plan for the 2006 24-Hour PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS [EPA-R09-OAR-2024-0472; FRL-12322-02-R9] received June 3, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1045. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Utah: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions and Incorporation by Reference [EPA-R08-RCRA-2024-0408; FRL-12226-04-R8], pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1046. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pesticide Tolerances; Implementing Registration Review Decisions for Certain Pesticides (Capric (Decanoic) Acid, Caprylic (Octanoic) Acid, and Pelargonic (Nonanoic) Acid) [EPA-HQ-OPP-2023-0454; FRL-12177-02-OCSP] [RIN: 2070-ZA16] received June 3, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.